

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,572	09/27/2006	Tamotsu Yamamoto	2006_1635A	6597
513 7590 01/21/2011 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			YABUT, DANIEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.138(a). In no event, however, may a reply be limitly filled as 100 to 100
Status
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 November 2010</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims
4) Claim(s) 1.4.11 and 15-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 and 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1.4.11.15.18 and 19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Application Papers
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 27 September 2006 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119
12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☒ All b ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3 ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper Nots/Mail Date.	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:	
S. Petent and Tradomerk Office		_

Art Unit: 3656

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 11, 18 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yamamoto (Japanese Patent JP2003184994A) in view of Takeda (US Patent 4,968,292).

Yamamoto discloses a rotating assembly (Fig. 1) comprising a(n):

Re claim 1

- Shaft (10) having an insertion portion (near 11; Fig. 4) and an outer circumferential surface (at 10; Fig. 4)
- Rotating member having an inner hole (near 24; Fig. 3), said rotating member being fixed to said shaft by inserting said shaft into said inner hole in an insertion direction (para. [0017])
- Diameter of said inner hole is smaller than an outer diameter of said insertion portion
 of said shaft (para. [0015] / L1-6), and a plurality of grooves (24) extending in the
 insertion direction are disposed on one of said inner hole and said outer
 circumferential surface of said shaft
- After the diameter of said inner hole is expanded by heating said rotating member,
 said shaft is inserted into said inner hole and said rotating member is cooled to reduce
 the diameter of said inner hole, said one of said inner hole and said outer

Art Unit: 3656

circumferential surface of said shaft having said plurality of grooves presses and raises the other of said inner hole and said outer circumferential surface of said shaft such that said other of said inner hole and said outer circumferential surface of said shaft enters said plurality of grooves so that said rotating member is fixed to said shaft and formed (para. [0017]). Note: Regarding this limitation, the MPEP states, "[E] ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process". See MPEP 2113.

Rotating member is a cam piece (20) having an outer circumferential surface (at 22;
 Fig. 4) with a portion of said outer circumferential surface of said rotating member having a cam profile (Fig. 4), said cam profile extending from a first location on said outer circumferential surface of said rotating member to a second location on said outer circumferential surface of said rotating member (see first and second locations on surface near numeral 22 in Fig. 4)

As to claim 1, Yamamoto does not expressly disclose a large-diameter escape portion in said inner hole is disposed inward of one of said first and second locations, and said large-diameter escape portion is configured to prevent contact with said outer circumferential surface of said shaft when said rotating member is fixed to said shaft, and the plurality of grooves and said escape portion extend through an entire thickness of said rotating member.

Application/Control Number: 10/594,572

Art Unit: 3656

Takeda teaches the use of a large-diameter escape portion (41) in an inner hole (near 41; Fig. 7) is disposed inward of one of said first and second locations (Fig. 7), and said large-diameter escape portion is configured to prevent contact with an outer circumferential surface of a shaft (34; C3 / L39-52) when said rotating member is fixed to said shaft (C6 / L39-45) and the plurality of grooves and said escape portion extend through an entire thickness of said rotating member (see in Fig. 7) for the purpose of promoting the ease of assembly (C3 / L53-64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a large-diameter escape portion in said inner hole is disposed inward of one of said first and second locations, and said large-diameter escape portion is configured to prevent contact with said outer circumferential surface of said shaft when said rotating member is fixed to said shaft, and the plurality of grooves and said escape portion extend through an entire thickness of said rotating member, as taught by Takeda, in the device of Yamamoto for the purpose of promoting the ease of assembly.

As to claim 1 further, Yamamoto as modified above does not expressly disclose the escape portion having a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential length of two adjacent grooves of said plurality of grooves.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the escape portion having a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential length of two adjacent grooves of said plurality of grooves, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.05.

Yamamoto as modified above further discloses the following:

Art Unit: 3656

Re claim 11

Shaft (10) having an insertion portion (near 11; Fig. 4), said insertion portion having

an outer diameter and an outer circumferential surface (at 10; Fig. 4)

Rotating member having an inner hole (near 24; Fig. 3), said inner hole having a

diameter that is smaller than the outer diameter of said insertion portion, and said

rotating member is being fixed onto said shaft by inserting said shaft into said inner

hole of said rotating member in an insertion direction (para. [0015] / L1-6)

Plurality of grooves (24) extending in the insertion direction, said plurality of grooves

being positioned on said inner hole and an outer circumferential surface of the shaft

• After the diameter of said inner hole is expanded by heating said rotating member,

said shaft is inserted into said inner hole, and said rotating member is cooled to

reduce the diameter of said inner hole, wherein said plurality of grooves are pressed

into said shaft so that of the said inner hole is fixed to said outer circumferential

surface of said insertion portion and formed (para. [0017]). Note: See above

regarding MPEP 2113.

Rotating member is a cam piece (20) having an outer circumferential surface with a

portion of said outer circumferential surface of said rotating member having a cam

profile, said cam profile extending from a first location on said outer circumferential

surface of said rotating member to a second location on said outer circumferential

surface of said rotating member (Fig. 3)

Large-diameter escape portion (41; Takeda) in said inner hole is disposed inward of

one of said first and second locations, and said large-diameter escape portion is

Art Unit: 3656

configured to prevent contact with said outer circumferential surface of said shaft when said rotating member is fixed to said shaft (C3 / L39-52; Takeda)

Escape portion has a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential
length of two adjacent grooves of said plurality of grooves, and wherein said plurality
of grooves and said escape portion extend through an entire thickness of said rotating
member (see at 41 in Fig. 7; Takeda)

Re claim 18

 Each of said plurality of grooves is formed in a trapezoidal shape (at 24a; para. [0015] /L14).

Re claim 19

- Each of said plurality of grooves has one of a trapezoidal shape, a circular shape, and a triangular shape (at 24a; para. [0015] / L14).
- Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (Japanese Patent JP2003184994A) in view of Takeda (US Patent 4,968,292), as applied to claims 1, 11, 18 and 19 above, and further in view of Arnold et al. (US Patent 5,207,120).

Yamamoto as modified above discloses all of the claim limitations, see above, but does not expressly disclose the hardness of the inner hole of the cam piece being higher than the hardness of the outer circumferential surface of the driving shaft.

Arnold et al. teaches the use of the hardness of the inner hole of the cam piece being higher than the hardness of the outer circumferential surface of the driving shaft (C4 / L49-55) Application/Control Number: 10/594,572

Art Unit: 3656

for the purpose of assuring that the insertion portion conforms with the inner hole upon installation (C4 / L52-53).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the hardness of the inner hole of the cam piece being higher than the hardness of the outer circumferential surface of the driving shaft, as taught by Arnold et al., in the device of Yamamoto as modified above for the purpose of assuring that the insertion portion conforms with the inner hole upon installation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 4, 11, 15, 18 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPO 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/594,572

Art Unit: 3656

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL YABUT whose telephone number is (571)270-5526.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard W. Ridley can be reached on (571)272-6917. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free), If you would

Art Unit: 3656

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DANIEL YABUT/ Examiner, Art Unit 3656 1/11/2011

/Richard WL Ridley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3656